

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

ANTHONY VILLANUEVA and
DREW INMAN

Criminal No. 19-292 (BRM)

ORDER ON PRETRIAL
MOTIONS

This matter having come before the Court on the omnibus motions filed by defendant Drew Inman (by Scott Krasny, Esq., appearing) for an order seeking relief on multiple motions (Dkt. 43); and the United States of America (by R. Joseph Gribko and Martha K. Nye, Assistant United States Attorneys, appearing) responding to said motions (Dkt. 49); the motions having been briefed and the Court having heard argument by way of video conference on March 2, 2022; and for the reasons set forth on the record at the hearing, the Court finds the following as to each motion:

IT IS, therefore, on this 3rd day of March, 2022,

(1) The defendant's motion to dismiss Count Four of the Indictment is **DENIED without prejudice**;

(2) The defendant's motion to compel notification of experts and expert reports from the Government is **DENIED as moot**, based upon the Government's representation that it does not intend to call any experts at trial;

(3) The defendant's motion to order the Government to comply with its *Brady* and *Giglio* obligations is **DENIED as moot**, as the Government acknowledges such obligations and represents that it intends to comply accordingly;

(4) The defendant's motion to order the Government to produce any 404(b) evidence that it intends to rely upon at trial, is **DENIED as moot**, based upon the Government's representation that it will comply with both court rules and the rules of evidence, and produce any such material ahead of trial in accordance with a scheduling order;

(5) The defendant's motion to compel the Government to produce all material that falls within the Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500, is **DENIED as moot**, based upon the Government's representations that it will comply with the disclosure obligations in a timely manner as determined by a scheduling order;

(6) The defendant's motion to compel the Government to produce all grand jury witnesses and grand jury testimony at the close of its case in chief is **DENIED, without prejudice**;

(7) The defendant's motion to be permitted leave to file additional motions, is **DENIED, without prejudice**.



HON. BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI
United States District Judge